

1 **REMARKS**

2 Claims 1-13, 15-25 were previously pending.

3 Please amend claims 1, 6, and 11.

4 Claim 14 is previously canceled.

5 Please cancel claims 21-25.

6 No new claims are added.

7 Claims 1-13, 15-20 are currently pending.

8
9 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject
10 application.

11
12 **1. Double Patenting**

13 Claims 1-13, 15-25 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory
14 obviousness-type double patenting over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,472.
15 Claims 21-25 are canceled. Base claims 1, 6, and 11 are amended. Applicant
16 submits that the currently pending claims, after amendment, do not double patent
17 the same invention as the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,472. Applicant
18 respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

19
20 **2. Statutory 35 USC 101 double patenting**

21 Claims 1-5 were provisionally rejected under 35 USC 101 as claiming the
22 same invention as US Patent Application No. 11/276,644. Applicant suggests that
23 the rejection is moot as base claim 1 has been amended. Claims 2-5 include the
24 language of base claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection
25 be removed.

1
2 **3. Double Patenting**

3 Claims 6-10 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type
4 double patenting over claims of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/276,644.
5 However, claim 6 has been amended. Applicant submits that claims 6-10 do not
6 double patent the same invention as the claims of U.S. Patent Application No.
7 11/276,644. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

8
9 Claims 1-13, 15-25 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory
10 obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent Application
11 No. 11/276,633. Claims 21-25 have been canceled.

12 Applicant respectfully disagrees that given a method claim, an apparatus or
13 module claim to practice the method claim is automatically obvious. However,
14 base claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended, so Applicant suggests that the
15 rejection is moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

16
17 **4. Patentable Distinction between Related Cases**

18 Regarding sections 7 and 9 of the Office Action, Applicant submits that the
19 claims of U.S. Patent Application No. 11/276,644 and the claims of U.S. Patent
20 Application No. 11/276,633 do not anticipate Applicant's claims because
21 Applicant's unamended claims were filed earlier in time than the claims of U.S.
22 Patent Application No. 11/276,644 and the claims of U.S. Patent Application No.
23 11/276,633. However, Applicant has amended all the current base claims to more
24 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.
25

1 **5. Duty to Disclose**

2 With regard to section 11 of the Office Action, Applicant suggests that
3 typically moving an element from the body of a claim to its preamble, or vice
4 versa, changes the scope of the claim (a preamble is not necessarily an element of
5 its claim). Therefore, Applicant did not intend that claims between related
6 applications should materially affect the patentability of each other and any
7 similarity that is deemed too close is merely an oversight. Thus, there was no duty
8 to disclose the later claims in the earlier application, even though Applicant
9 normally discloses all relationships between applications as a matter of standard
10 practice (see, for example, “related applications” heading and section at the
11 beginning of Applicant’s specification).

12
13 **6. Amendments to Base Claims 1, 6, and 11**

14 Applicant amends the base claims to more particularly point out the subject
15 matter. Specifically, for example in claim 1, by replicating on a host computer an
16 address translation table of the target computer the host computer can replicate an
17 exact or similar condition of the virtual memory set up as it existed on the target
18 computer before the target computer’s CPU halted. This allows the target
19 computer to be debugged on a working host computer.

20
21
22 **Conclusion**

23 Applicant suggests that all pending claims 1-13 and 15-20 are now in
24 condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and
25 issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of

1 this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before
2 issuing a subsequent Action.
3

4 Respectfully Submitted,
5

6 Date: 6/30/06
7

8 By: /Mark C. Farrell/

9 Mark C. Farrell
10 Reg. No. 45,988
11 (509) 324-9256 x 243
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25